

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Kareen Anderson,

Plaintiff

v.

United States, et al.,

Defendants

Case No. 2:18-cv-02173-JAD-EJY

**Order Adopting Report and
Recommendation and Denying
Request for Entry of Default**

[ECF Nos. 30, 35]

Pro se plaintiff Kareen Anderson brings this action to redress constitutional violations and torts that he claims he suffered during his 2016 arrest and detention at the Nevada Southern Detention Center. Magistrate Judge Elayna Youchah screened Anderson's complaint, found that Anderson's *Bivens* action against FBI Agents Burke, Rowe, and Kennedy in their individual capacities may proceed, along with his state-law negligence claims against Dr. Saavedra and Nurse Ubina in their individual capacities, and against CoreCivic.¹ But she recommends that I dismiss with prejudice Anderson's due-process claim in count 1; malicious-prosecution claim in count 2; imputed-negligence claim in count 3; all claims for violations of Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 4, 5, and 9; and his claims against Dr. Saavedra and Nurse Ubina in their official capacities, as stated in counts 4 and 6.² The deadline for objections to that recommendation passed without an objection or any request to extend the deadline to file one. "[N]o review is required of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation unless objections are filed."³

¹ ECF No. 35 at 13.

² *Id.* at 14.

³ *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003); *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003).

1 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the magistrate judge's report and recommendation
2 [ECF No. 35] is **ADOPTED** in full; **Anderson's due-process claim in count 1; malicious-**
3 **prosecution claim in count 2; imputed-negligence claim in count 3; all claims for violations**
4 **of Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 4, 5, and 9; and his claims against Dr. Saavedra**
5 **and Nurse Ubina in their official capacities, as stated in counts 4 and 6, are DISMISSED**
6 **with prejudice.**

7 In a motion mailed on October 9, 2019, Anderson requests that the court enter default
8 judgment against the defendants.⁴ In support of that request, he notes that some defendants had
9 been served with his amended complaint but failed to timely respond. Those defendants had
10 filed a timely motion to extend their response deadline,⁵ which the court granted.⁶ The
11 defendants' deadline to respond to the amended complaint is now 10 days from today.⁷
12 Accordingly, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for entry of default [ECF No. 30] is
13 **DENIED. Defendants have until December 9, 2019, to answer** or otherwise respond to the
14 claims that remain in the amended complaint as a result of the screening order [ECF No. 35] and
15 this order.

16 Dated: November 27, 2019

17
18 
U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey

21 _____
22 ⁴ ECF No. 30.

23 ⁵ ECF No. 28.

⁶ ECF No. 33.

⁷ *Id.*